

REMARKS

This application, as amended herein, contains claims 1 - 5, and 7 - 16, and newly added claim 18 and 19. Claims 6 and 17 have been canceled.

The Examiner is thanked for the helpful suggestion with respect to the objection to claim 7. With amendments to claims 1 and 7 herein, and the cancellation of claim 6, it is believed that this objection is now moot.

Claims 1 - 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vorobiev. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' invention, as set forth in claim 1, as amended herein, is directed to a method for operating a computer system comprising having at least one content provider for providing content to a user coupled via a portal which may also be coupled to a user; said at least one content provider offering a new content to the portal; the new content being any new feed or channel, the portal comparing credentials of said at least one content provider with stored credentials of registered content providers; the portal evaluating the new content, and the portal accepting or rejecting said new content of at least a particular provider included in said at least one content provider based on said stored credentials. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at least at page 2, lines 1-2, and lines 18-19; page 3, lines 12-17; and page 6, lines 11-15.

Vorobiev does not teach or suggest at least one content provider offering a new content to the portal, the new content being any new feed or channel, the portal evaluating the new content, and the portal accepting or rejecting said new content of at least a particular provider included in said at least one content provider based on said stored credentials. In this regard reference is made to the general teachings and the abstract of Vorobiev, wherein a recipient (user) must supply categories of information of interest. Information from providers must be tagged with category information. In Vorobiev, if information outside of one of these categories is supplied by a provider, it is not clear that a user will ever receive the information.

In sharp contrast to Vorobiev, Applicants' invention, as set forth in claim 1, provides the ability to accept or reject a particular content provider and/or new content based on stored credentials, where the new content is any new feed or channel. This new feed or channel may have content completely outside any of the categories that must be identified by a user in Vorobiev.

In fact Vorobiev, actually teaches away from Applicants' invention because Vorobiev is dealing with categories supplied by users and not new feeds or channels of content providers or of a particular web site. Thus, Vorobiev does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention as set forth in claim 1.

Independent claims 10 has been amended in a manner analogous to independent claim 1. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 10 is also patentable over Vorobiev.

Claim 4 recites performing automatically said comparison of the credentials with an intelligent program having a rule database. The portion of Vorobiev cited by the Examiner (Column 10, lines 10-31) makes only a vague reference to some software. There is no specific teaching or suggestion of an intelligent program having a rule database. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is also directed to patentable subject matter.

Claim 5 recites performing manually said comparison of the credentials. Again, the portion of Vorobiev cited by the Examiner (Column 10, lines 10-31) makes no reference to such act. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is also directed to patentable subject matter.

The remaining original claims depend from one of independent claims 1 or 10. These claims recite further elements, which in combination with the elements of the claim from which they depend, are not shown or suggested in the art of record. For the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 10 it is submitted that the remaining claims are also directed to patentable subject matter.

Newly added method and system claims 18 and 19 respectively, deal with automatically registering at least one content provider. These claims serve to further

distinguish Applicants' invention from the prior art.
Examination of these claims is respectfully requested.


Conclusion

Applicants' invention permits the acceptance or rejection of new content providers and/or new content, wherein the new content is any new feed or channel. This is done independently of the nature of the content; that is the content does not need to fall into specific categories. There is nothing taught or suggested by Vorobiev which permits such acceptance or rejection. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants' invention is patentably distinguishable from Vorobiev

In view of the allowable nature of the subject matter of all of the claims, if the Examiner cannot issue an immediate allowance, it is respectfully requested that he contact the undersigned to resolve any remaining issues.

Applicants respectfully request an extension of time of three months for the filing of this paper. A check in the amount of \$1,020 is enclosed to cover the required fee.

Respectfully submitted,



David Aker, Reg. No. 29,277
23 Southern Road
Hartsdale, NY 10530
Tel. & Fax 914 674-1094

2/21/2006
Date